



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/670,638	09/24/2003	Andreas Arning	DE920010081US1	6848

46270	7590	07/12/2007
IBM CORPORATION (SYL-RSW)		
C/O SYNNESTVEDT & LECHNER LLP		
1101 MARKET STREET, SUITE 2600		
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19107		

EXAMINER
JEAN GILLES, JUDE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2143	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/670,638

Applicant(s)

ARNING ET AL.

Examiner

Jude J. Jean-Gilles

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is responsive to communication filed on 09/24/2003. Claimed priority is granted from foreign application No: 02021152.0 with a priority date of 09/24/2002.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 5, 12, 16, 23, and 27 and are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 5, recites the confusing phrase "*the addressee field*" in line 1. There is no antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 6-11 depend on claim 5 and are rejected for the same reason mentioned above for the rejection of claim 5.

Claim 12, recites the confusing phrase "*the correct addressee*" in line 1. There is no antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 13-15 depend on claim 12 and are rejected for the same reason mentioned above for the rejection of claim 12.

Claim 16, recites the confusing phrase "*the addressee field*" in line 1. There is no antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 17-22 depend on claim 16 and are rejected for the same reason

Art Unit: 2143

mentioned above for the rejection of claim 16.

Claim 23, recites the confusing phrase "*the correct addressee*" in line 1. There is no antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 24-26 depend on claim 23 and are rejected for the same reason mentioned above for the rejection of claim 23.

Claim 27, recites the confusing phrase "*the addressee field*" in line 1. There is no antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 28-33 depend on claim 27 and are rejected for the same reason mentioned above for the rejection of claim 27.

Appropriate correction is required. The above noticed problems are just exemplary. Applicant is required to totally check the application for error and correct the same.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. **Claims 1-33** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Quine et al (Quine), Pub. No. 2003/0115279 A1.

Regarding **claim 1-33**, Quine discloses:

1. A computerized method for predicting the correct addressee to be filled-in in an addressee field in an e-mail system, whereby user-related history information, including the user's sent and/or received e-mail, is analyzed for associating the most probable addressee for an e-mail to be addressed (fig. 5A-B, 6, 7, &9; Note that inherently, to automatically send the email message to the recipient requires to fill in the addressee field; see (par. 0065-0075) comprising the steps of:

analyzing at least one of the following attributes of said user-related history information and of said e-mail to be addressed:

- a subject line of said sent, received, and to-be-addressed e-mail;
- the length of said sent, received, and to-be-addressed e-mail;
- the language used in said sent, received, and to-be-addressed e-mail;
- a time associated with said sent, received, and to-be-addressed e-mail;
- the vocabulary used in said sent, received, and to-be-addressed e-mail;
- topics discussed in the body of said sent, received, and to-be-addressed e-mail;
- the salutation form used in said sent, received, and to-be-addressed e-mail;
- the closing form used in said sent, received, and to-be-addressed e-mail;

whereby Text Mining methods are used to associate attribute values with respective addressees, thus yielding a plurality of single analysis results usable for said prediction (par. 0065-0075), and

weighting the plurality of said single analysis results to provide a Data Mining Model adapted to offer at least one top favorite addressee proposal as a prediction result (par. 0074,

0075, 0092-0095, see fig 9 for statistical analysis).

2. The method according to claim 1, wherein said e-mail system has multiple use modes, further comprising the step of: using separate Data Mining models for different use modes (par. 0065-0075; Note that the sender has the choice of initially finding the closest match the first time around,, or wait if the message is undeliverable, to use the data Mining Models).

3. The method according to claim 1, further comprising the step of: performing a training of the Data Mining model triggered by any of the following criteria: when a user overwrites the addressee proposal(s) made by the e-mail system, more frequently than limited by a predefined threshold level; when the e-mail system is confronted with a number of new addressees not found in the user-related history information, and the number or fraction thereof is higher than a predefined threshold level; after a predefined time limit has passed (0085-0087).

4. The method according to claim 1, in which the analysis results are generated in a table-like form, in which each attribute to be analyzed is associated with a predicted value, accompanied by a respective confidence value (fig. 9).

5. A computerized method for completing the addressee field in a user-initiated "new mail" within an e-mail system, comprising the steps of: on an occurrence of an incomplete entering of an addressee term in said addressee field, running a predictive Data Mining method based on a trained Data Mining Model developed by: analyzing one or more attribute values of user-related

Art Unit: 2143

history information and of said e-mail to be addressed, whereby Text Mining methods are used to associate attribute values with respective addressees, thus yielding a plurality of single analysis results usable for said completing the address field; and weighting the plurality of single analysis results to provide a Data Mining Model adapted to offer at least one top favorite addressee proposal as an address-completion result; and conveying at least the most probable addressee proposal to the user as an address-completion result (figs. 5 A-B, 6, 7, 9; par. 0065-0075, 0092-0095).

6. The method of claim 5, wherein said analyzing step includes at least the step of analyzing one or more of the following attribute values of said user-related history: a subject line of sent, received, and/or to-be-addressed e-mail; the length of said sent, received, and/or to-be-addressed e-mail; the language used in said sent, received, and/or to-be-addressed e-mail; a time associated with said sent, received, and/or to-be-addressed e-mail; the vocabulary used in said sent, received, and/or to-be-addressed e-mail; topics discussed in the body of said sent, received, and/or to-be-addressed e-mail; the salutation form used in said sent, received, and/or to-be-addressed e-mail; and the closing form used in said sent, received, and/or to-be-addressed e-mail (0065-0075).

7. The method according to claim 5, further comprising the step of: offering a subset of a predefined quantity of top favorite addressee proposals to the user for selection (0066-0071).

8. The method according to claim 5, further comprising the step of automatically providing an

Art Unit: 2143

addressee field pre-filled with a top favorite addressee term (0065-0075).

9. The method according to claim 5, further comprising the step of testing the Data Mining model on a test set of e-mail, said test set not being used in the attribute-value analyzing step, before predicting the most probable addressee, and issuing a hint to the user, indicating the confidence of the predicted addressee proposal (0065-0075).

10. The method according to claim 5, further comprising the step of: automatically expanding a trunk of an address term with the most probable addressee term, when the trunk of the most probable addressee term is present in the addressee field (0065-0075).

11. The method according to claim 5, further comprising the step of: cross-checking an addressee term entered by the user with a list of top favorite addressees, determined by the system, and issuing a warning, if the probability is high that the user-entered addressee term is faulty (0065-0075).

claims 12 and 23 are similar to claim 1, and are rejected for the same reason.

claims 13 and 24 are similar to claim 2, and are rejected for the same reason.

claims 14 and 25 are similar to claim 3, and are rejected for the same reason.

claims 15 and 26 are similar to claim 4, and are rejected for the same reason.

claims 16 and 27 are similar to claim 5, and are rejected for the same reason.

Claims 28 is similar to claim 6, and are rejected for the same reason.

claims 18 and 29 are similar to claim 7, and are rejected for the same reason.

claims 19 and 30 are similar to claim 8, and are rejected for the same reason.

claims 20 and 31 are similar to claim 9, and are rejected for the same reason.

claims 21 and 32 are similar to claim 10, and are rejected for the same reason.

Art Unit: 2143

claims 22 and 33 are similar to claim 11, and are rejected for the same reason.

Conclusion

6. This action is made **non-final**. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from examiner should be directed to Jude Jean-Gilles whose telephone number is (571) 272-3914. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and every other Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley, can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3719.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.


Jude Jean-Gilles

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2143

JJG

July 4, 2007


DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100